

REMARKS

With entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-17 remain pending.

Specification

In the Action, the Examiner queries whether the reference to polyvinyl acetate in the first example in the specification is complete. The statement in the specification refers to “a mix composed of ... and 8 l polyvinyl acetate of 50%.” The 50% figure refers to the concentration of polyvinyl acetate in this last 8 liters ingredient of the mix. The above amendment of the specification transposes the phrase for readability into “... and 8 l of 50% polyvinyl acetate.” While the original wording of the phrase conveys this same meaning, the amended wording is believed to be more easily readable.

Abstract

The above amended abstract corrects the informalities objected to by the Office.

Declaration

The Office asserts that the declaration fails to formally claim priority to the counterpart Hungarian patent application. Applicant disagrees. The declaration clearly states, “I hereby claim foreign priority benefits under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) of any foreign application(s) for patent or inventor’s certificate or of any PCT international application(s) designating at least one country other than the United States of America listed below...” followed by a listing of Hungarian Patent Application No. 0205406, filed February 7, 2002. The specification and transmittal cover sheet for the patent application likewise include the reference to this Hungarian application in conformance with 35 U.S.C. § 119. Applicant therefore clearly made a claim of priority to this Hungarian patent application. Moreover, the Office previously acknowledged this priority claim on the Updated Filing Receipt mailed June 6, 2002. Accordingly, the Office should continue to recognize this priority claim. Applicants have therefore made the priority claim as required under 37 CFR § 1.55(a)(1).

Applicant is in the process of obtaining a certified copy of the priority Hungarian patent application, and will provide same to the Office as soon as it is obtained. Per the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.55(a)(2), the certified copy must be filed before the patent is granted.

Definiteness of the Claims

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite. More particularly, the Office asserts the claims are confusing for failure to affirmatively recite process steps. Applicant has addressed this and the Office’s other indefiniteness concerns in the above

claim amendments. The amended claims meet the requirements of § 112, and should now be allowed.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, the application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. If any further issues remain concerning this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned to discuss such matters.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By



Stephen A. Wight
Registration No. 37,759

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 226-7391
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446